Int. Sec. Div letter dated 10/15/69. It also cannot reflect the purpose of my visit to ISD, which was one time only. I have the records.

The first record, probably 5834-serial missing last two digits, is the 10-21-69 EJH:jmv airtel for Director fo Savannah and Memphis with MURKIN files only indicated.

The 10/15/69 letter is not attached as the airtel says it is. Not in what was given me.

The first graf on me refers to my books as "most critical of the Bureau," the greatest of sins. It has a biased and less than accurate reference to my having been fired and rehired by State and then resigning.

And then it refers to my FOIA request on this subject, saying "It was approved that his letter not be ~~xxxxxxx~~ acknowledged."

It accurately describes Stoner as then one of Ray's lawyers and "a notorious segregationist," which is not an exaggeration.

The attached note orders the Savannah office (of origin on Stoner and WSRP) to "be alert for any additional information along these lines from any source..." which can mean only intrusion in Ray's legal rights and mine under the First Amendment, whether by informant or illegal interception of communications.

What appears to be 5835 also just manages to have the last two digits removed in copying. It is the 10/21/69 EJH;jld memo for Director to the Assistant Director, ISD, responding to the 10/15/69. It refers only to what Stoner had told me, that the FBI offered him ~~xxx~~ $25,000 to kill King (Stoner has repeated the story and has a credible means of identifying the source of his offer as an FBI informant.) The memo concludes there is no basis for this.

5836 refers to a Phoenix letter to Bureau, is a MC LHM, relating to a Leavenworth prisoner.

5837 is the JCH:lfm (Joe Hester?) airtel of 10/27/69 to Director attaching a carbon of the letter signed by Cassidy Jensen saying there is no basis to what Stoner said.

5838 is the Rosen to DeLoach LHM of EJH;jmv headed MURKIN, 10/20/69. Note that in time this precedes the serials above.

It begins with a false statement each of the two parts of which is false. The first is that I was interviewed by a Department attorney at my request. The second part of this is what is inherent, not stated, that this was the purpose of my being there. The second false statement is that "This is obviously an attempt ~~xx~~ by Weisberg and Stoner to discredit the Bureau.

It then goes into the distorted reflections of my writing and me and the State matter, concluding with a pointed suggestion that the keeping of files on me be hidden. "(This is a public source data, article in 'Washington Post' 11-18-47.)" (Parenthetically and probably to hide the source of the defamatory leak, the original source, the old Times-~~Xxxxxxxx~~ Herald, is not given) It repeats there was approval not to respond to my April 1969 FOIA request and at the end of the graf has "(100-55158)" which is probably the file on me.

The reason given for not interviewing wither one of us it our alleged backgrounds. Which is also a way of avoiding any specifics Stoner might have had. Hoover OKed all.

(Although mine are earlier documents relating to Ray's efforts to get the extradition documents follow.)

Now what really happened is nothing like this and is not in any way suggested in this. Obviously ISD was not of jurisdiction in the Ray/King case. Criminal, perhaps CRD, were, as of any knowledge I could have had then. I'd not have gone to the FBI with such a story but to them, if anybody.

Lil and I had driven to Washington. Our first stop, early in the morning, was the Vogel mansion on about 31 St off Woodland Drive. We were friends with Louis and Diana, who cared for Mrs. Vogel, then well into her 80s. There had been a news story about arrests in a plot against Haiti. I was discussing this with Louis. As best I recall he suggested I should call DJ. If not I did it on my own. In any event, the operator referred me to FBI as I recall Criminal and I was told I'd be called back. I was, by ISD. Or told who to call there.

call in ISD. I was then asked to go to what I think is the Triangle Bldg on 9th where it has offices on the west side of the floor in which that particular office was. I think they made it for the afternoon.

I had told Louis of the coincidence of my having interviewed to plotters of a Haiti invasion who were so open they allowed me to tape it and made open phone calls and spoke in response to others in my presence. These were two of the anti-Castro soldier-of-fortune types who figure in the Warren files, Gerald Patrick Hemming and Lawrence Howard. (It was my second taped interview with Howard.)

I recall that rather than inviting myself in I offered my files, including the tapes, all of which were non-confidential. Instead I was asked to go in. I did ask for a copy of the charges filed in that case. It is not unlikely that during conversation the call that Stoner had made from Baltimore airport may well have come up. Especially if the lawyer asked me what I was doing or anything about my work - how indeed would I have conducted such interviews before the Department filed charges. (Stoner tells that story often. I saw and heard it on a St. Louis TV talk show I've referred to earlier in these notes.)

The lawyer was quite excited. Why not-proof of conspiracy/and plotting?

(Hemming claims a CIA past and then claimed CIA support in that venture, including a plane or planes.)

So this lawyer asks if he can come up Monday. I think that was a Friday. I say of course. He says "Good! I'll see you Monday."

He did not. Nobody ever did. But under date of 10/13/69 signed by John H. Davitt for J. Walter Yeagley, ISD, is a short letter saying nothing a out this FBI stuff, only "reference is made to your recent conversation with Mr. James P. Morris of this Division" and enclosing a copy of the indictment in United States v. Rene Leon, et al.

In getting the records out it turns out that what I said about NSRP is exactly the opposite of what the FBI says: that the NSRP was framing the FBI.

5841- both of these of the same serial- relate to the keeping from me of the evidence introduced into open court in the trial of an American plus the admission that they were Ray's as a matter of right-and denied to him. What the British court really did is surrender its records to FBI agents who gave them to Canale. Only after my FOIA efforts did State retrieve them from Canale.

5842, number incomplete but has to be this, does not match worksheet descriptions. Date.

5846 the McRae stuff referred to earlier. Not threats.& Further refs in 5848.